

REMARKS

In the Office action, claim 5 was withdrawn; claims 1, 3, 21 and 22 were rejected as anticipated by Jahn; claims 1-4, 12, 14, 15 and 21-22 were rejected as being unpatentable over Friel in view of Jahn; claims 2, 4, 13, 16, 17, 23 and 24 were rejected as being unpatentable over Jahn in view of Corrigan; and claim 25 was rejected as being a process capable of being performed by the apparatus and system.

As to withdrawn claim 5, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 may be reinstated upon indication of allowable subject matter that is generic as to the material applied. Claim 1 as pending would allow claim 5 to be reinstated.

As to the rejections on the merits, it is noted that the main references cited (Jahn, Friel and Madden) all relate to making available some selections of paint and or parameters, most notably in a vehicle assembly line. The applied references thus basically presume an existing material application system and are not directed to a remote configuration concept for the material application system. It is respectfully submitted that the art of record makes no suggestion of a system that allows remote configuration of the actual material application system as presently claimed.

In order to clarify this aspect of the invention, the independent claims are amended to recite that the user selects a pump and gun from different choices thereof. The cited art makes no suggestion of such an arrangement. It is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended place the application in condition for allowance and that the amendment may be properly entered because there would be no need for further searching or substantive examination. Note that original dependent claim 5 recited a gun, nozzle and pump. If there were available art relating to such selections, it would have been noted in earlier actions. It is submitted that no one in the cited art appreciated, taught or suggested the claimed concept of configuring a material application system from a location remote from the manufacturing site wherein the user actually selects a pump and gun from different choices, along with inputting a characteristic of the material to be applied, and further with the configuration program then verifying compatibility of the selections. Most notably, Jahn does not teach or suggest selection of the pump and gun

components from different choices. At col. 6 line 60 through col. 7 line 2 Jahn the mathematical model has fixed factor settings based on experimental techniques. There is no apparent suggestion that the user can change these settings, much less any suggestion that the user would make selections from different pump and gun choices. Moreover as to new claim 26, there is no suggestion as to having selectable choices of control systems.

Applicants traverse the rejections of the dependent claims but detailed comment will be deferred pending further examination of the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 24, 2004

By: _____
Leonard L. Lewis
Reg. No. 31,176
(216) 622-8683